

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/828,451	SKAKOON ET AL.	

  

<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Kathryn Odland	3743	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Kathryn Odland.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Suneel Arora.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 23 November 2004
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
**Claims discussed:**

90, 103, 108 and 125

**Prior art documents discussed:**

See IDS dated September 7, 2004

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Kathryn Odland

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was contacted to amend claims 90, 103, 108 and 125 to define over the newly cited art. Applicant has included the limitation that the instrument can be immobilized at any location within the access lumen. This is not demonstrated in the prior art of record.